REMARKS

Claims 1-31 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-31 have been rejected.

Claims 2, 14, 24, and 28 have been amended. The amendments to dependent Claims 2, 14, 24, and 28 are presented for clarification purposes only and are not presented for any reasons related to patentability. These amendments are not necessary to overcome any of the outstanding rejections.

Claim 32 has been added.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claim 28 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, Examiner states on page 2 of the present Office Action dated November 1, 2007 that regarding Claim 28, "[i]t is indefinite as to what Applicants intend for the first storage is to be an element or device". To address Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, Applicants have amended Claim 28 to consistently recite a "first storage element." Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Murley et al. (USPN 7,133,884) in view of Verma et al. (USPPN 2005/0021487) hereinafter referred to as ("Verma"). Applicants respectfully traverse Examiner's rejection.

Generally, Murley discloses an unobtrusive database object copy method that includes creating a consistent copy by "starting with a current snapshot of the target database objects and selectively removing updates from it back to a user specified arbitrary point-in-time". (Murley, Abstract). Verma generally discloses a system and method for "supporting multiple independent transactional resource managers on a single logical volume, in which each resource manager is a unit of storage management". (Verma, Abstract).

Exemplary Claim 1 recites:

> discovering a <u>plurality of components</u>, wherein <u>a database comprises the</u> <u>plurality of components</u>, and wherein the database is stored on a storage volume;
> selecting a component of said plurality of components;
> selecting a data management resource of a plurality of data management resources using an attribute of said component; and
> generating a point-in-time image of said component <u>using said data</u> <u>management resource.</u>

On page 5 of Examiner's present Office Action, Examiner asserts that paragraph [0011] of Verma discloses the recited generating step of exemplary Claim 1. Paragraph [0011] of Verma discloses:

> To facilitate use of a resource manager, application programming interfaces may be provided, including functions to create, start, and shut down a resource manger. Other functions may be defined, such as to back up and restore the files associated with a resource manager, and <u>employ</u> <u>point in-time-recovery of a particular state in time of a resource manager.</u>

After careful examination of Examiner's Present Office Action (OA), Applicants believe Examiner is employing the following mappings to support Examiner's rejection:

Exemplary Claim 1	Examiner's OA
"plurality of components"	"source database objects", col. 2, lines 52-53 of Murley
"database"	"database", col. 2, lines 52-53 of Murley
"storage volume"	"physical storage" (suggested by col. 1, lines 20-22 of Murley)
"data management resource"	"resource manager" (Abstract, paragraph [0011] of Verma)

For example, referring to the step of "discovering a plurality of components, wherein a database comprises the plurality of components, and wherein the database is stored on a storage volume" of exemplary Claim 1, Examiner cites col. 2, lines 52-53 of Murley, which discloses the identification of one or more source database objects in a database, and col. 1, lines 20-22 of Murley, which suggests the storage of a database in

physical storage. Also, referring to the step of "generating a point-in-time image of said component using said data management resource" of exemplary Claim 1, Examiner cites paragraph [0035] of Verma, which discloses a resource manager that provides transactional services, and paragraph [0011], which discloses that point-in-time recovery of a particular state of a resource manager may be employed.

However, no matter what mappings are utilized by Examiner, Applicants assert that nothing in the combination of Murley and Verma discloses (or renders obvious) "generating a point-in-time image of said component using said data management resource," as recited in exemplary Claim 1. At most, Examiner's combination of Murley and Verma discloses a database, which includes source database objects, stored in physical storage, and point in-time-recovery of a particular state in time of the resource manager (which is mapped to a "data management resource"), rather than generating a point-in-time image of a component among "a plurality of components", as recited in exemplary Claim 1. If Examiner is mapping source database objects to "a plurality of components", recovering a state of the resource manager (mapped to "data management resource") is irrelevant, since the resource manager is not a "source database object", but a "unit of storage management", as disclosed in paragraph [0011] of Verma. Also, point-in-time recovery of a particular state in time of the resource manager does not disclose (or render obvious) "generating a point-in-time image of a component", as recited in exemplary Claim 1. The point-in-time recovery of a state is clearly different from generating a point-in-time image of a component in a database.

In the alternative, Examiner may assert that "resource managers" disclosed in paragraph [0011] of Verma may be mapped to the "plurality of components" and "usage-related functions" for facilitating the use of resource managers (paragraphs [0011], [0062], and Figure 2 of Verma) may be mapped to "data management resource". However, "resource managers" are not components of a database (as recited in exemplary Claim 1, "a plurality of components, wherein a database comprises the plurality of components"), but "a unit of storage management" where "each database has its files independently associated with a transactional resource manager such that database operations do not affect other operations on the volume". (Verma, Abstract). Since nothing in the combination of Murley and Verma discloses (or renders obvious) each and every element of exemplary Claim 1, independent Claim 1, similar independent Claims 13, 23, and 28, and all dependent Claims are not rendered unpatentable by the

combination of Murley and Verma. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Applicants have amended Claims 2, 14, and 24 to recite how the components of the database structure are discovered and identified. Support for the amendments can be found in paragraphs [0033]-[0035] and Figure 5 of the present Specification.

Newly-added claim

Applicants have added Claim 32 to recite how the components of the database structure are discovered and identified. Support for Claim 32 can be found in paragraphs [0033]-[0035] and Figure 5 of the present Specification.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the application and the claims therein are believed to be in condition for allowance without any further examination and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephone interview, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at 512-439-5087.

If any extensions of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) are required in order for this submission to be considered timely, Applicant hereby petitions for such extensions. Applicant also hereby authorizes that any fees due for such extensions or any other fee associated with this submission, as specified in 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17, be charged to deposit account 502306.

Respectfully submitted,

Brenna A. Brock
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 48,509
Telephone: (512) 439-5087
Facsimile: (512) 439-5099